

A

488.e

2

10

DEFENCE
OF THE
Church of *England*
FROM
PRIESTCRAFT,
IN
VINDICATION
OF THE
Contested Clause of the xxth Article.

Extracted out of the
Vindication of the Church of *England*
from the Aspersions of a late Libel, entituled,
Priestcraft in Perfection, &c.

By the Author of the Vindication.

The ungodly is trapped in the work of his own hands, Ps. ix. 16

L O N D O N:

Printed for R. Wilkin at the King's Head in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1711.

DEFENCE

Church of England

TRIEST CRATE

VINDICATION

Church of England

Church of England

Church of England

Church of England

P
F
entit
there
Eory
that
mati
in op
in bi
proof
upon
And
been
eithe
Auth
dispe
Libe
may,
have
short
denc
Clau
suffic

T H E

P R E F A C E.

HAVING some time since publish'd A Vindication of the Church of England from the Aspersions of a late Libel, entituled, Priestcraft in Perfection, &c. and therein endeavour'd to give a full and satisfactory Answer to all the Objections produc'd by that Author against the Authority of the affirmative Clause of the Twentieth Article, whether in opposition to Archbishop Laud's Defence of it in his Speech in the Star-Chamber, or in farther proof of that Charge of Forgery, which is now upon this occasion renew'd against the Clergy: And in prosecution of this Argument having been oblig'd to write a much longer Book, than either was necessary for the bare proof of the Authority of that Clause, or is likely to be dispers'd into half the Hands, into which that Libel has come: Therefore that the Antidote may, if possible, reach as far as the Poison, I have been perswaded to draw together into as short a Compass as I could, all the positive Evidence in that Book brought in behalf of the Clause in question; and this being abundantly sufficient to prove it genuine, and consequently

The Preface.

to disprove its pretended Forgery, I thought it would be enough after that, to give the Heads of that Author's Objections against this Evidence, and of the Arguments by which he endeavours to make his Charge good, together with the Substance of what I have answer'd at large to both: and I was willing to hope, that such an Abstract as this might be useful for common Readers, who may not so well spare, either Money to purchase the larger Vindication, or Time to peruse it.

After having long had this in my Thoughts, that which at last determin'd me to set about it, was a Letter from abroad, giving an account, how industriously the Author of Priestcraft had dispers'd that Pamphlet beyond the Seas; and by procuring an Extract of it to be publish'd in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres** had taken care to spread the Infection of it all over Europe: and Mr. Bernard, the Author of that Journal, professing himself as ready to publish an account of any Answer to that Libel, as he was, that of the Libel it self: This I took to be a piece of Satisfaction in all Justice so due to the World, that I could not refuse contributing my poor Mite to it; especially when at the same time it gives me an Opportunity of doing our excellent Church Right, as well at home as abroad.

And if in drawing out this Abstract I do not always tie my self up to the Method of the Vindication, which yet I shall follow in the main, I hope I may be allow'd to take a

* *Mois de Mars 1710. p. 344. & seqq.*

† *Ibid. p. 345.*

little
perbe
for a
little
I sha

W
of th
Pape
of Q
the Y
conce
and p
lion,
Writ
dent
whol
tion
of th
belle
tend
take

I
seller
Abri
the V
matt
a gre
whol
very
all I

* R
in Per
tres u
A
entitu
P. 43

The Preface.

little more liberty with my own Book, than perhaps might be proper with another's; and for that reason I shall not scruple to make any little addition to the Argument of That, which I shall think may add to the force of it.

What I have said at large in the Preface of the Vindication to prove against another Paper*, that the Act of Parliament of the 13th of Q. Elizabeth enjoin'd Subscription to all the XXXIX. Articles without Exception, those concerning Discipline as well as Doctrine, and particularly to the Homily against Rebellion, (which serves for an Answer to another Writer;) this, and what else was only incidental to my Argument in that Work, I shall wholly omit here; together with those Reflections upon another Libel^b at the latter end of the Preface, which shew how little that Libeller understands, either the Question he pretends to meddle with, or even the Author, he takes upon him to commend.

I must add for the Satisfaction of the Bookseller, who otherwise may apprehend from this Abridgment, some Prejudice to the Sale of the Vindication, that besides those incidental matters in the Preface of that, now mention'd, a great part of the Book it self is here either wholly omitted, or but lightly touch'd, as not very material to the main Question (which is all I consider here) and yet so necessary in An-

* Reflections on a late Pamphlet, entituled, Priestcraft in Perfection. Which is also abridg'd, Repub. des Lettres ubi sup. p. 344.

^b A Detection of the true Meaning, &c. of a Book, entituled, A plain and easy Method with the Deists, P. 43.

The Preface.

swer to my Adversary, that without that he would have said I had not answer'd him; in-
somuch that this is properly an Abstract but of
a small part of that Book: in which they who
shall think it worth their while to peruse it,
will find so many Instances of false Reasoning
and Disingenuity in the Author of Priestcraft;
such Evidence of the wicked Design of that
Label, discover'd in those Atheistical Inferences
that conclude it; to say nothing of the parti-
cular Vindication of Archbishop Laud, Bishop
Pearson, my Lord Bacon, Dr. Heylin, and
others, from that Author's unjust Censures and
Misrepresentations; and especially of the Uni-
versity of Oxford, and their Original Subscrip-
tion of the Lower House of Convocation in 1571,
from his Charge of Fraud and Forgery; nor of
that large account there given of the two Cam-
bridge MSS; all this and so much more pass'd
by here will be found in the larger Vindica-
tion, that an Abstract of so small a part of it
can be of no Prejudice to the whole; tho' I hope
it may be of use to such, who content them-
selves with the bare proof of the Fact in que-
stion, and have neither Leisure nor Inclination
to follow the Author of Priestcraft thro' so ma-
ny other Particulars.

A DE-

DEFENCE
OF THE
Church of *England*
FROM
PRIESTCRAFT, &c.

THE Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection, &c.* charges the Clergy of the Church of England with the Fraud of inserting and continuing this Clause [The Church has Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith] in the XXth of her XXXIX Articles: and in proof of this Charge alledges, that the said Clause never pass'd either the Convocation of 1562, or that of 1571, nor was contain'd in the imprinted Book of Articles, that was ratify'd (as he calls it) by Parliament, (A^ct. 13. Eliz. Chap. 12.) and that these being all the Authorities, upon which the

A Defence of the

Articles of our Church stand, therefore this Clause has none at all, but is a *perfect Forgery* of the *Priest's*, contriv'd to justify their Usurpation of a Power and Authority, to which the Church hath no right.

In Answer to this heavy Charge I undertake in the *Vindication* to shew, first the great Improbability, and then the utter Falseness of it.

That nothing is more improbable, than that the Clergy should have been guilty of such a Forgery, I argue, not only from the Integrity of their Character in general, which is free from any such Stain; but particularly from hence, that they could have no end to serve by it; for that the end just now mention'd, as assign'd by the *Author of Priestcraft*, to have induc'd them to commit this Forgery, could have no place here; because all the *Power* and *Authority* asserted in this pretended forg'd Clause, is no more than what is essential to the *Catholick*, and to every *Particular Church*; viz. a Power to determine all the Circumstances necessary to the decent and orderly Worship of God, and an Authority, as *Guardian* of the Faith, to preach and declare it, and to enforce it by Ecclesiastical Censures; but that only as a competent, not as an infallible Judge of Controversies; for want of which distinction the *Author of Priestcraft* confounds the question of the *Authority* of the Church, allow'd by all *Christians*, with that of its *Infallibility*, deny'd by all but the *Papists*. Accordingly I shew, that the very same Power and Authority is, and always has been, asserted and

exerc-

exercis'd in all the Churches, and even pretended Churches in the World; and particularly in ours, both elsewhere, and in these XXXIX. Articles; one Branch of it most expressly in the XXXIVth, and the other implicitly in the VIth, and in this very XXth Article, exclusive of the Clause in question. The end therefore alledg'd to have induc'd the Clergy to commit this Forgery being thus apparently false, and there being no other end they could serve by it, I argue, that there is all the Presumption in the World on their side, that they did not commit it; for that it is as senseless to imagine they would contrive and carry on such a Cheat for no end at all, as it is to give the name of *Priestcraft* to what upon that Supposition had been the utmost degree of Stupidity and Infatuation. And that on the other side there is a very great Presumption, that the Fraud of *rasing* and *expunging* this Clause was committed by the Enemies of our Church; who, besides that they would hereby gain a considerable Argument against her Authority, and a great Advantage against her Clergy, by representing the former as an Usurpation supported by the Forgery of the latter, are seldom known to stick at any means to compass their wicked ends; of which I give several Instances; and one a *Rasure* of the same nature with this before us, and that in the very Bible, committed to countenance their Rebellion; and then (like this, and in support of it) charg'd

upon our Clergy, as another Forgery to maintain the Authority of the Church. I mean their expunging the Contents of the 149th Psalm, which expresses a *Power in the Church over the Consciences of Men*, and are coeval with that Translation of the Bible read in Churches, and were printed in all the Editions of it, 'till after they had murder'd the King; and then to justify that Murder, changing that mystical Interpretation of the Psalm into a literal one, and by new Contents of their own, which expresses a *Power over Men of the World*, and the like, subjecting the *Persons of Men* to that Power, instead of their *Consciences*; and suitably to the blasphemous Motto of their Rebel Commonwealth, *God with us*, making the Scriptures countenance their *binding Kings with Chains* in a literal sense, and *Nobles with Fetters of Iron*; and accordingly that Verse, and *Curse ye Meroz* were the common Texts of all their Trumpeters to Rebellion. Nor contented to have committed so foul a *Rasure* with so black a Design, to add guilt to both, seeing the old Contents have been generally restor'd in all the Editions since 1661, they have the Insolence to call that a Forgery of the Clergy (as they do this of the contested Clause, which was most probably likewise expung'd by them) and to alledge it as another instance of *Priestcraft*, contriv'd to support an Authority in the Church, which they pretend is an Usurpation: whereas in reality it is another instance of the *malicious Cunning of the Faction*, contriv'd to subvert all the Authority of the State,

as the former was to undermine that of the Church, and artfully brought by one of their own ^b Preachers to countenance that other.

But to return to the Contested Clause. Having thus, I hope, remov'd the Prejudices of the Reader, and endeavoured to gain upon his Mind in behalf of the Clergy, and made way for a favourable hearing of their Cause, I proceed to consider the Merits of it, and here I undertake to shew, that there is not only the greatest presumption, but all the certainty the nature of the thing will bear, that they have not been guilty of the least Fraud or Forgery in this matter; but that in direct contradiction to what the Author of *Priestcraft* asserts, the Contested Clause of the XXth Article pretended to be forg'd by them, was unquestionably pass'd with all the rest of the Articles by both the Convocations above mention'd: and (tho' I think that no addition to its Authority, yet because that Author lays so much stress upon it) that it was also contain'd in the imprinted Book of Articles referr'd to by the Parliament^a; and consequently is of as undoubted Authority, as any other part of the Articles. And in proof of this main Fact, I join issue with the Author of *Priestcraft*, and appeal to those very Records of Convocation, and to that imprinted Book of Articles, from whence alone that Author tells us^c, there is any certainty of this Fact to be had. But

^b Robinson's Review of the Case of Liturg. &c. Pref. p. 13.

^c Vindic. p. 2. to p. 20.

^a Act. 13. Eliz. c. 12.

^c Priestcraft, p. 12.

because

because those Records have been burnt ever since the Fire of London, and 'tis uncertain what printed Copy is referr'd to by the Act of Parliament above mention'd; and therefore 'tis impossible now to have recourse, either certainly to that very printed Copy, or at all to those very Records; or to have any farther evidence in this matter, than that the Clause in question was certainly contain'd; both in that imprinted Book, whatever the Copy referr'd to was, and in those Records, when they were yet in being: therefore I undertake to prove, as with respect to that Book, (from the account given of it in the Act of Parliament, which refers to it, and from other Arguments) that whatever printed Copy of the Articles that was, and whether any one of that Edition be still extant or no; yet it undoubtedly contain'd the Clause in dispute: so with regard to the Records of Convocation now lost, that the said Clause was as undoubtedly contain'd in them. And this is putting the matter not only upon that Author's own Issue, but upon the clearest Issue in the World; for to pass over the Act of Parliament, as of little Authority in this case; and the Convocation of 1571, as agreed on all hands to have review'd and subscrib'd the very same Articles pass'd in that of 1562: if it be once made appear, that the Contested Clause was certainly contain'd in the Original Records of the Articles, pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, that must be own'd to be a manifest proof, and all the evidence that the nature of the thing will now bear, that it

was

was not surreptitiously inserted into the Article after it was pass'd, but was pass'd with that and all the rest of the XXXIX Articles in that Convocation.

I. That this Clause was contain'd in the Original Records of the Convocation of 1562 I prove from unquestionable Testimony; the only proof of which that Fact is now capable; and the first Testimony I give of it, is that of an authentick Copy of the XXth Article with this Clause in it, transcrib'd from those Records, and attested under the Hand of a publick Notary; and this produc'd by Archbishop *Laud* in the Star-Chamber, while the Records were still in being, and all Mankind might have access to them, and be Eye-witnesses of the Fact in Debate. And to corroborate this Evidence I observe,

1st, That the Archbishop appeal'd to these Records in Defence of the Authority of this Clause, not only thus publicly in the *Star-Chamber*, where it might be thought necessary for his own Vindication, but also in his History^a of his Troubles, and even in his private Notes on a Book of Articles still extant, where Malice it self cannot pretend, he could have the least inducement to falsify^b.

2^{dly}, That by this frank and open Appeal to the Records, all Parties at that time were so fully satisfy'd of the Authority of the Controverted Clause, and have remain'd so firmly perswaded of it ever since, that there

^a Vindic. p. 23, &c.

^b Remains, Vol. I. p. 209.

^c Vindic. p. 35, 36, and 187.

was not the least Objection then made to it, nor (as far as I can find) has there been from that time till now¹. And I give several remarkable Instances of the Party's Silence in this Particular; as,

1st, In two *Answers* made to the Archbishop's *Speech* in the *Star-Chamber*, neither of which attempt to invalidate this Evidence from the Records produc'd there; and that written by Archbishop *Williams* (who could not be ignorant of a Fact so easily known at that time, as whether the Contested Clause was in the Records or no) makes not the least Objection to this Passage of the *Speech*.

2dly, In the Articles of Archbishop *Land's* Impeachment, where tho' in two of them successively they charge the Archbishop with *maintaining Popish Doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion*, and with *aiming at a vast, unlawful, and presumptuous Power in himself and Successors*, a Power that was even *Papal and Tyrannical*; of which it was impossible to have given a better proof, than if they could have shewn, that he had falsify'd the Publick Records to give credit to a *Popish Clause* of the Articles, as the Author of *Priestcraft* calls it, or as it was stil'd by those primitive *Libellers*, to a *New Article of Religion brought from Rome*, which gave the *Prelates full Power to alter the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church at a Blow*, and that an Article of his own forging: yet there is not the least tittle in any of them either of

¹ Vindic. p. 36, 37.

² Vindic. p. 37, 185.

this Forgery or Falsification; not a word of the least Fraud with respect to the Articles, even where with regard to the Canons, he is accus'd of procuring many of them to be *surreptitiously pass'd*, and others to be *subscrib'd*, &c. which had never been voted and pass'd as they ought (Art. 5.) a Charge so like this other, and to which this would have given so much Credit, if they could have prov'd it, that their Silence sufficiently shews they could not¹.

3dly, In the *Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines concerning a Confession of Faith*, address'd to the Long Parliament, by whose Authority they were then sitting at *Westminster*, tho' it was during their Session, and most probably at their Instance, that a Committee of that Parliament did send to examine Archbishop *Laud*, and to search his Office for what Originals of the Articles could be found there; and the Archbishop himself conjectur'd (as it was very natural) that that Search was made on the Score of the Contested Clause of the Church's Power, and in order to that Assembly's establishing something concerning it², and therefore they must have known certainly, whether that Clause were in the Publick Records or no; yet when they come to speak of this Power of the Church, they are so far from disowning it, or alledging this Assertion of it to have crept into our Articles by any such Fraud or Forgery as is pretended, and the

¹ Vindic. p. 188, &c.

² Hist. of his Troubles, p. 209.

Archbishop to have falsify'd the Publick Records in favour of the Cheat; that they employ two whole Chapters^a in asserting this Power in all the Branches and Parts of it, and expressly declare, almost in the words of the Contested Clause; but much more fully, that *It belongeth to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine Controversies of Faith, and Cases of Conscience, to set down Rules and Directions for the better ordering of the publick Worship of God, and Government of his Church, &c.* — *Which Decrees and Determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be receiv'd with Reverence and Submission; not only for their Agreement with the Word, but also for the Power whereby they are made, as being an Ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his Word.*

4thly, In the Reasons for the necessity of Reformation in the Church, offer'd to the Parliament by divers Ministers of sundry Counties in England, in the Year 1660, after the Faction had been Masters of all the Records in the Kingdom, and indeed of the Kingdom it self for about twelve Years, and may be said to have govern'd for near twenty, tho' one of their Objections was against the XXth Article, and against this very Clause, yet they are so far there from questioning its Authority, that they evidently suppose it, and only complain, that *it being said Article XXth, The Church has Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controver-*

^a Chap. 30, and 31.

^b Chap. 31. p. 53, 54. Vindic. p. 189, &c.

sies of Faith, we may not, say they, enquire what is meant by the Church, whether the Church Catholick or of England: Nor what the Church of England is; what Rites and Ceremonies it may ordain; or how far her Authority extends in Controversies of Faith, ^p &c.

5thly, In the Conference at the Savoy the Year after, there was not the least Exception made either to the Authority of the contested Clause, or to Archbishop *Laud's* Appeal to the Publick Records in Defence of it, though that Conference finally concluded in a Dispute concerning the Power asserted in that ^a Clause.

From all which Instances I conclude, that the Party themselves, who first objected against this Clause as a Forgery, were so fully satisfy'd of its being genuine, from Archbishop *Laud's* appeal to the Publick Records, which they could not fail to consult upon this Occasion, that they had nothing left to urge against it, and were therefore constrain'd by their Silence to signify their Assent. And to strengthen this conclusion I observe,

1st. That it had been so very easy to prove both the Archbishop and his Publick-Notary guilty of falsifying the Records in this particular, if the contested Clause had not been contain'd in them, that no probable Reason can be given, why this was not prov'd; but because upon searching the Records they found the Clause was there, and that neither the Archbishop nor his No-

^p Vindic. p. 190.

^a Ibid. p. 191.

tary had been guilty of the least Falsification in the matter. And we may yet more certainly infer this, if we consider,

2dly. That it was also very much the Interest of the *Party* to make this discovery against the Archbishop, if he had falsify'd the Records; and that not only to make good this attack against the Authority of the Church, and to fasten the odium of so foul a Crime upon the Archbishop and his Brethren; but to wipe off all suspicion of as foul a Crime from themselves, I mean that of having raz'd and expung'd this Clause, which the Archbishop had openly charg'd upon them, and which they were so much concern'd to wipe off, that in both the Answers abovemention'd, what little is reply'd to this part of the Archbishop's Speech is for the most part upon the defensive. And so is what we find said thereto in another Paper, written after the Restoration. And to confirm this Remark, we may observe farther,

3dly. That the *Party* themselves, who are always quick-sighted in what concerns their Interest, were so well appriz'd how much it was concern'd in this matter: what a Blow it would be to the Authority of the Church, to shew that a Clause had been forg'd in support of it, and fraudulently inserted into her Articles; and that the Archbishop had falsify'd the Publick Records to

Vindic. p. 188, &c.

Hamilton's Some Necess. of Reform. p. 14. *Vindic.* p. 154.

give Countenance to the Cheat: how much blacker an Article against him such a Falsification would have made, than any they had to accuse him of, and how much plainer a Proof than any other they could bring, of that *Popery* and *Tyranny* they laid to his Charge: And lastly, How perfectly themselves would be hereby clear'd from that Imputation of having ras'd and expung'd this Clause, which the Archbishop had left upon them, and must rest upon them, unless they could prove he had falsify'd the Records, and that the contested Clause was not in them. They knew all this so well, that (as was observ'd above) they sent both to examine the Archbishop, and to search his Office upon this Occasion, as they raked into all the Passages of his Life to find matter of Accusation against him: From all which Considerations laid together, I think we may assuredly conclude, that a Fact, which had been so easily disprov'd, if false, and to disprove which it was so much the Party's Interest, and they knew it to be so, and therefore took so much pains, and yet were not able to disprove it; that that Fact was most certainly true, and consequently that the contested Clause was contain'd in the Records, to which the Archbishop appeal'd, because the Party never pretended to shew, or so much as to assert, that it was not. And this will appear still more evident from what I observe farther,

4^{thly}. That the learned Antiquary Mr. *Selden*, whom I find to have been the very Person employ'd to search the Records for

this Clause; did not only assert the Authority of it, but preserv'd two considerable Manuscripts which bear Testimony to it; one a Paper with Archbishop *Land*'s hand to it, containing the XXth Article with the contested Clause in it, together with some Extracts out of the Registers of the Convocations of 1562, and 1571, relating to the passing of the Articles; which Paper is still extant, and is suppos'd to be the very Copy under the Hand of a Publick-Notary produc'd by Archbishop *Land* in the *Star-Chamber*: The other an Original Subscription of the Lower-House of the Convocation of 1571, to a Latin Copy of the Articles printed Anno 1563, which also contains the Clause in dispute, and is now in the *Bodleian* Library among Mr. *Selden*'s Manuscripts. From hence 'tis plain, that this Gentleman was convinc'd, that the Clause in question was genuine, and therefore must have found it in the Records: for as less Evidence than that was not likely to make one, that was so little a Friend either to the Church's Power, or to the Archbishop, instead of his *Accuser* upon this Article become his *Advocate*; so if he had not found this Clause in the Records, that alone would have convinc'd him, that it was not genuine, viz. that it had not pass'd the Convocation of 1562, together with the rest of the Articles, of which those were the Original

* Some Necess. of Reform. p. 14.

† Table Talk, p. 34.

Records; but had been fraudulently inserted into the Article afterwards *.

And all the Party, most probably upon that search of the Records, seem to have been so thoroughly convinc'd of this, that (as I observe)

6thly. In the Year 1642, the disputed Clause was printed in a Book of Articles, that appears to have been publish'd by the *Faction*, both from its coming out under no Printers name; whereas all the other English Editions bear those of the King's or Queen's Printers; and because it is expressly said to be *printed for the Benefit of the Commonwealth*, a style to which that Party were then hastning. And if this Edition of the Articles was theirs, there cannot be a greater Confirmation of this Testimony produc'd by Archbishop *Laud* in behalf of the Authority of the contested Clause, than that they who first objected against it as a Forgery, were hereby so fully convinc'd of its Authority, that they publish'd a Book of Articles with that Clause in it *. And thus much for the first Testimony, whereby I undertook to prove, that the contested Clause was contain'd in the Original Records of the Convocation of 1562.

II. The next Testimony I produce is that of an Eye-witness, who saw this Clause in those Records, while they were yet in being. This Eye-witness was Dr. *Heylin*, a Person of unquestionable Credit, who in

* Vindic. p. 184, & seqq. and 192.

* Ibid. p. 202, &c.

confirmation of that Copy of this Clause transcrib'd from the original Records, and produc'd by his Patron Archbishop *Laud* in the *Star-Chamber*, under the hand of a publick *Notary*, expressly assures us, that he himself saw those Records, and this Clause in them: for *thus much*, says he, *I can say of mine own knowledge, that having occasion to consult the Records of Convocation, I found this controverted Clause verbatim, in these following words: Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus, Et in fidei contraversiis auctoritatem:* Which is also a confirmation of the next Testimony I bring in proof of the Authority of this Clause, and that is,

III. The first printed Edition of the Articles, wrought off most probably as soon as they were pass'd, for it bears date *An 1563*, which Year in the Printer's Account was begun even before they pass'd, for that was not 'till *February 1563*. In this Edition, of which there are several Copies still extant, the controverted Clause is contain'd, and that in the very words cited by Dr. *Heylin* from the Records, whereas all the other Latin Copies of the Articles do something vary from this, explaining the word *Ritus* by the Addition of *five Ceremonias*: Hence I argue, that as it cannot be imagin'd, that any one would dare to falsify the Articles so soon after they were pass'd, much less that they should be thus falsely publish'd by the *Queen's* Printer, and by her Authority; and that therefore the Clause printed

in this Edition must have pass'd with all the rest of the Articles, and been copy'd at the same time with them from the Records: So this Clause, which is something differently worded in all the other Editions of the Articles, agreeing to a tittle with the Records in this Edition, as Dr. *Heylin* assures us, who was an Eye-witness of it, that is an additional Argument, that this Edition was immediately copied from the Records; and therefore that the contested Clause contain'd in it, was likewise contain'd in them, and pass'd the Convocation of 1562, to which those Records belong'd ².

And whereas the Author of *Priestcraft* pretends, that there was an English Edition of the same date without the Clause, I shew that there is no proof of that, but manifest proof of the contrary, viz. that there was also an English Edition said to have been dated 1562, which contained the contested Clause; and yet that if there had been one then that wanted it, that would have been a much better Argument of the *rafure*, than of the *forgery* of the Clause in question ³.

And that this Clause was also pass'd in the Convocation of 1571, I prove,

First, From an original Subscription of the Lower House of that Convocation, made to a printed Copy of the very same Edition of the Articles, now mentioned as containing this Clause in it, which is still extant

² Vindic. p. 128, 151, & seqq.

³ Ibid. p. 163, & seqq.

in the *Bodleian* Library amongst Mr. *Selden's* MSS, and is one of those Evidences of the Authority of this Clause, that was above taken notice of to have been preserved by that great *Antiquary*: which I observe is also a confirmation of the Authority of that Edition, and consequently of the Testimony now brought from it in proof of the Authority of the Clause in question. ^b I prove farther that it pass'd the Convocation of 1571,

Secondly, From all the Editions of the Articles to this Day down from that Year inclusively; ^c which as they generally contain the contested Clause, excepting two or three spurious Copies of them, for which I account, ^d and are in that regard another Argument of its Authority: So in the *Ratification* printed at the end of them, they all expressly assert, that they were the *Articles of 1562, which were deliberately read, and confirm'd again by the Subscription of the Hands of the Archbishop and Bishops of the upper House, and by the Subscription of the whole Clergy in the nether House in their Convocation in the Tear of our Lord 1571,* and therefore all the Testimonies alledg'd above in proof, that the contested Clause was contain'd in the Records of the Convocation of 1562, are so many Evidences, that it was also pass'd in that of 1571 ^e.

And I prove by the same Argument, that this Clause was also contain'd in the

^b Vindic. p. 179, &c.
^d Ibid. p. 177, 196, &c.

^c Ibid. p. 194, & seqq.
^e Ibid. p. 95, 96, 126.

imprinted Book of Articles referr'd to by the Act of the 13th of *Elizabeth*, which enjoin'd Subscription to the XXXIX Articles^f. For that Act does also expressly call them *Articles of Religion*, — whereupon it was agreed by the *Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the Year of our Lord 1562, &c.* This is the Title of the imprinted Book there referr'd to, and indeed of all the English Books of Articles that were ever printed since their first passing; as upon all occasions since these Articles are generally stil'd the Articles of the Convocation of 1562: and the Act mentioning the Book it refers to only by that Title, which is common to all the printed Copies of it, without specifying any particular Edition of that Book, it must be concluded to mean the same Articles, which are generally contain'd in all those Editions; and consequently those Articles, of which the controverted Clause was a part, even tho' there had been an Edition of the Articles then extant, which had wanted the Clause, as I shew we have no certainty there was: for as to that of 1571 without the Clause, it is most probable that was not printed 'till after the Act was pass'd, at least there is no proof it came out before: and the Edition without date that wants the Clause, which is the only Edition extant without it, that has any appearance of being elder than 1571, as for want of date it is uncertain when it was

^f Vindic. p. 26. & Pref.

printed; so for that reason, and because it wants a Clause, which has been shewn to be a genuine part of the Articles, it may be suspected to have been printed long after the time it makes shew of; and those marks of Antiquity of which it boasts, to have been added by the same Fraud that omitted the Clause *. This I argue may be suspected, and it is enough for this purpose, that the contrary cannot be made out; and yet I urge, that if it could, and it were certain that at the time the Act pass'd, there was an Edition of the Articles extant without the Clause; yet unless the Act had expressly specify'd that Edition, it must be understood to mean an Edition with it; especially since the Parliament seems to have acted in this matter in concert with the Convocation then sitting, and to have made this Act at their Request, thereby to enforce Subscription to the Articles, which the Bishops found it difficult to obtain by their mere spiritual Authority: And since it could not be unknown to the Parliament, that the Book of Articles subscrib'd by that Convocation, while their Act was passing, was (as we have now seen) an Edition which contain'd the contested Clause. I urge farther, that as the Convocation would have been tender of signing a different Copy of Articles from that, to which they knew the Parliament were then enjoining Subscription: So it is not probable, that the Parliament would en-

join Subscription to a Copy, different from what they knew was sign'd by the Convocation about the same time. It is certain they would not, if (as is most likely) it was at the Request of the Convocation, that they made this Act. But be that as it will, it is certain they would not oppose the Convocation then sitting, and that in a matter of which themselves were not so proper Judges, without designing it as a mortification to them; and if they had done it with any such Design, it is as certain, that they would for that reason have specify'd the Edition of the Articles, to which Subscription was thus to be enjoin'd in opposition to the Convocation. This I think may suffice to shew, that the contested Clause was undoubtedly contain'd in the imprinted Book of Articles referr'd to by the Act of Parliament, how uncertain soever it be, what Edition of the Articles that was; and yet I offer such Arguments, as render it highly probable that the Book referr'd to in the Act, was one of the Editions of that Year printed immediately after the Convocation had confirm'd the Articles, of which Editions there are three still extant, all containing the contested Clause; and if it was one of them, that is still a farther proof, that the Clause in question was contain'd in it: ^a and though I think it signifies little to the Authority, either of the disputed Clause, or of the Articles in general, that Subscription was enjoin'd to them by an Act

^a Pref. p. 48, &c.

of Parliament, (which yet was of great use to enforce it) and the chief reason of my taking the trouble to prove the contested Clause to have been in the Book of Articles referr'd to by that Act, was in compliance with my *Adversary's* Opinion of a pretended Authority given to the Articles by the Parliament; yet as the Parliament by enjoining Subscription to the Articles without any formal Design of ratifying, or confirming them, (which was not properly their business) did yet own them, and thereby obliquely confirm them: So whatever was contain'd in the Book of Articles referr'd to by that Act, tho' it receiv'd no Authority from the Act directly; yet inasmuch as the Act concern'd the Articles pass'd in the Convocation of 1562, and would not therefore refer to any Book for them, that either did not contain all the Articles pass'd there, or contain'd any Article, or Clause of an Article that was not pass'd there, its being in the Book referr'd to by that Act is obliquely an Argument of its Authority, not as confirm'd by that Act, but as pass'd by that Convocation.

Having by all this positive Evidence put the Authority of the contested Clause beyond dispute, by proving in direct contradiction to the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection*, that it did certainly pass both the Convocation of 1562, and that of 1571, together with all the rest of the Articles, and was contain'd in the *imprinted Book* of Articles referr'd to by that Act of Parliament, that enjoind Subscription to them; and

and therefore has all the Authority, that even in his Opinion any part of the Articles have. I need not have troubled my self to give any farther Answer to that Author, nor been at the pains of considering, either his Objections to the Testimony in behalf of the Clause here produc'd, most of it from Archbishop *Laud's* Speech, or those new grounds on which he pretends to make good this old charge of Forgery: For since the whole Question between him and me is, whether the controverted Clause did really pass the Convocation of 1562 together with the rest of the Articles, or was fraudulently inserted into them since; after I had once shewn by undeniable Evidence, that this Clause was contain'd in the original Records of that Convocation, there was an end of the Controversy between us: If it was contain'd in those Records, it was unquestionably pass'd in the Convocation of 1562 together with the rest of the Articles; and therefore was not inserted into them since by any Forgery or Fraud whatsoever, Which so intirely subverts our *Detector's* whole Scheme of *Priestcraft*, that after this if he were able to discover twenty Inconsistencies in Archbishop *Laud's* Defence, that would be no support to his sinking Cause; and if he could produce never so many old MSS, all wanting the Clause in question, that would be so far from being the least Impeachment to its Authority, that on the contrary their wanting a Clause of the Articles, that has been so fully prov'd to have been contain'd in the original Records, would

demonstrate them to be of no Authority themselves.

However I have *ex abundant* answer'd both all the Objections, and all the New Arguments of that Author; and I shall here add the Sum of what I have said to both.

His Objections against the Publick Records appeal'd to by Archbishop Laud, would endeavour to persuade us, that there could be no such Records in the Archbishop's Office at that time, though we have the most undoubted Evidence that there were, and that the contested Clause was in them. As he gives them us they are no less than six, but may be reduc'd to a much less Number; the three first and the two last of the six being not so much different Objections, as several Branches of the same, and some of those repeated. The substance of those five taken together seems to be this.

That there being a Manuscript of the 39 Articles without the Clause, sign'd by both Houses of the Convocation of 1562, and left by Archbishop Parker, President of that Convocation, to *Corpus Christi* College in *Cambridge*, where it has remain'd ever since the Year 1575, in which that Archbishop died: And the Subscription of the Lower-House (he might have said of both Houses) bearing the same date in that Manuscript with that of the original Articles, and they also having been left with Archbishop Parker; both which last Particulars appear from the Postscript to the first Latin Edition of them: And lastly, the Acts

of that Convocation mentioning a double Subscription of that Lower-House; the first by some Members of it, and the latter by the Body of that House on the Fifth of February. From all this together, joined (I suppose) with what Archbishop Laud says in his *Star-Chamber-Speech*, of a Subscription by one House of Convocation which he found among the Records; the Author of *Priestcraft* first forms to himself this wise supposition, That that Subscription by one House was the Record to which Archbishop Laud appeal'd, and was that Subscription above-mention'd, to have been made by some of the Members of the Lower-House, before that other made on the Fifth of February by the whole Body of that House; and upon this Supposition he argues,

1st. That if that double Subscription above-mention'd was made to numerically the same Articles, then what Archbishop Laud appeal'd to cou'd be only *forg'd Records, with a sham List of Names tack'd to them*, because they contain'd a Clause not to be found in the *Cambridge Manuscript* of 1562, which is concluded to be one of those two Subscriptions. But

2^{dly}. That if that double Subscription was not made to numerically the same Articles, then that in the *Cambridge Manuscript* appearing to have been made on the said Fifth of February, the other appeal'd to by Archbishop Laud, must have been that made before the Fifth of February, only by some Members of the Lower-House. Accordingly,

3^{dly}. That

3dly. That Archbishop *Laud* himself own'd, that the Record to which he appeal'd was subscrib'd but by one House of Convocation; and therefore

4thly. That if it was subscrib'd only by one House, and before the *Cambridge* Manuscript, then all its Authority must have been superseded by that other Subscription, both subsequent to this, and made by both Houses. And

5thly. That that other Subscription, concluded to be the original Record of the Articles, having been in *Corpus Christi* College Library ever since Archbishop *Parker's* death, there could be no Records of the Articles in the Archbishop's Office, when Archbishop *Laud* appeal'd to them.

6thly. That in this case the Authority of Archbishop *Parker*, who was President of both those Convocations, in which the XXXIX Articles pass'd, is of more weight than that of Archbishop *Laud*.

To this long Argument, as I have here set it down in its full force, and in all its Branches, I answer;

1st. That it is no Argument there never was such a Record as Archbishop *Laud* appeal'd to, because so many Years after it has been destroy'd, we are not able to answer all his Questions about the Time, Manner, and other Circumstances of its pretended Subscription.*

2dly. That it is not certain (nor I think probable) that the Record of the Articles

* Vindic. p. 40, &c.

* Id. ibid.

was subscrib'd at all. It is more likely that it was only ingross'd from a preparatory Subscription, and afterwards pass'd by both Houses *viva voce*; and yet to make his Argument good, he must first prove that the Record was subscrib'd¹.

3dly. That if it was also subscrib'd by the Convocation, it was certainly subscrib'd as well by both Houses, as after the *Corpus Christi* Manuscript of 1562, and yet must have bore the same dates with that Manuscript, whether that were the very preparatory Subscription from which the Record was ingross'd, or only a foul Draught of it^m.

4thly. That Archbishop *Laud* does not own, either that the Record of the Articles was subscrib'd at all, or that it was subscrib'd only by one House of Convocation; for that his Words are: *The original Articles of 1562, with many Hands to them I did see and peruse, but whether the Bishops Hands were to them or not, I cannot remember*: Which may either be understood of the original Subscription of 1562, from which the Record was ingross'd, and the Archbishop might in six Years time forget that the Hands of the Bishops were also there: or it may be meant of that Latin Copy of the Articles still extant with the original Subscription of the Lower House of Convocation of 1571 annex'd to itⁿ; which

¹ Vindic. p. 109.

^m Ibid. p. 41, &c. and p. 105, 114, &c.

ⁿ Ibid. p. 61, &c.

though a printed Copy, yet on account of that Subscription is also call'd an Original °.

sibly. That the wise Supposition on which this doughty Objection is rais'd, involves several Contradictions; as that this pretended Subscription to the original Record was both that made by some of the Members of the Lower House, and that made by the body of that House; that the Record to which Archbishop *Laud* appeal'd, was that which in his *Star-Chamber Speech*, he says, *he found subscrib'd by all the Lower House*, though he there most expressly says, that that was (not a Record but) a printed Book of Articles, *the Book of 1563*, and that *subscrib'd indeed by all the Lower House*, but of what Convocation? Not of that of 1562, but most expressly of the *Convocation of this very Year of contradiction 1571*; and because it seems this was not enough to prevent our Author and his *Oxford Friend*, from mistaking one Convocation for another, the Archbishop immediately adds this farther distinction; *Dr. John Elmar (who was after Lord Bishop of London) being there Prolocutor: Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Paul's, having been Prolocutor in 1562, and yet living and present, and subscribing in 1571*. And yet this notable *Detecter of Frauds*, gravely tells us ^p that for ought he knows the Archbishop might call this the subscription of the original Articles of 1562. and to add to all this Contradiction, he here supposes this Sub-

° Barlow's Rem. p. 51.

^p Priestcraft, p. 38.

scription (so manifestly that of 1571) to have even preceded that of 1562; and Archbishop *Parker's* Manuscript, which wants the contested Clause, to be the Record which had it: For he argues, that that Manuscript being then at *Cambridge*, there could be no such Record as Archbishop *Laud* appeal'd to then in his Office, though the Archbishop appeal'd to that Record for the very Clause which this Manuscript wants, and the want of which (after the Evidence that has been produc'd for that Clause's being genuine) is alone a demonstration, that this Manuscript is no Record of the Articles⁹.

6^{thly}. That we have yet farther, and those incontestable Proofs, that the *Cambridge* Manuscript of 1562 is no Record of the Articles, and shall produce them when we come to consider the Grounds on which the Author of *Priestcraft* pretends to support his Charge of Forgery.

7^{thly}. That it is impertinent to alledge Archbishop *Parker's* Authority in this Case, and to prefer it to Archbishop *Laud's*; since the Authority of Archbishop *Laud*, though of great weight in it self, yet has not been insisted on in defence of the Clause, because the first Accusers of the Church upon this Head had so little regard for his Authority, that they laid the pretended Forgery chiefly to his Charge. And as to Archbishop *Parker*, he never gave so much as his Opinion in the Case, as far as we can

⁹ Vindic. p. 96.

learn: and all the ground there is for pleading his Authority here, is only because these pretended Originals of the Articles were his^r. This, I hope, is a full Answer to all that is contain'd in five of this Author's Objections against the Record appeal'd to by Archbishop *Land*.

His fourth and only remaining Objection does also consist of many Particulars, and is in short this, That Dr. *Mocket*, Archbishop *Abbot's* Chaplain, having in his *Poli-tica Ecclesiae Anglicanae* publish'd the Articles without the contested Clause; and his Book being call'd in and burnt, chiefly (as is suppos'd) for that Reason, and yet that Reason being not assign'd; 'tis alledg'd, that the Court Bishops then at variance with Archbishop *Abbot* would, out of Enmity to him, and in Defence of the Clause, have certainly assign'd the omission of it as the Cause of burning that Book, had there been any Records then at hand to vindicate the Authority of the Clause from that suspicion, said to be cast upon it by this Book's discovering the Archbishop's Judgment in this matter, as well as that probably of many other Divines. To which long Objection I answer also in several Particulars.

1st. That it need not be inferr'd from Dr. *Heylin's* Account of this matter, that the Book was burnt out of Enmity to Archbishop *Abbot*, but only to prevent the Errors of it spreading under the Countenance of so great an Authority: and that the rest

of his Suppositions under this Head are likewise false, or nothing to his purpose [†].

2dly. That if the true Cause of burning the Book was its wanting the contested Clause, yet it is not certain, either First, That the Court Bishops were so fond of shewing their Enmity against Archbishop *Abbot* as the Objector pretends, who measures their Enmity to that Archbishop by his own to all the Clergy: or Secondly, that they thought this so glorious an Opportunity of shewing their Enmity to him: or Thirdly, that they had not some Reasons not to do it that time.

3dly. That Dr. *Mocket's* Book was so far from shewing the Judgment of the Archbishop, and other Divines upon this Question, that it did not so much as shew his own; and yet if it had shew'd both his and their Judgments to have been against the Clause, that would have been no prejudice to the Authority of it; or if it had, yet since there were other Reasons for burning his Book, it was not necessary to publish this, at least not so necessary, as to infer from their not doing it, that they were not able to defend the Authority of the Clause, and therefore that there were no Records in the Archbishop's Office at that time, proper to determine the Question [†].

Having thus answer'd all the Author of *Priestcraft's* Objections against the Record appeal'd to by Archbishop *Laud*, I proceed to consider those new Arguments, by which

[†] Vindic. p. 49, &c.

[†] Ibid. p. 32, & seqq.

that Author undertakes to make good this old Charge of Forgery; and to prove, that the contested Clause was neither pass'd in Convocation, nor ratify'd, as he calls it, by Parliament. That this Clause was not pass'd by the Convocation either of 1562, or of 1571, the Author of *Priestcraft* undertakes to prove from the *Cambridge Manuscript* of 1562 abovemention'd, and another of 1571, the latter subscrib'd by the President and ten Bishops of the Convocation of 1571, as the former by both Houses of that of 1562, both left by Archbishop *Parker*, President of both those Convocations, to *Corpus Christi* College in *Cambridge*, where they have been ever since his Death, and both wanting the Clause in question,

To this I answer; that these Manuscripts are not the Records of the Convocations to which they relate, nor therefore of any Authority in the present Dispute. And this I prove by several Arguments; first of both Manuscripts in general, and then of each in particular, *viz.*

1st. Because they are neither of them ingross'd nor in Parchment *.

2^{dly}. Because they both want the Confirmation of the Royal Authority *.

3^{dly}. Because they were both given to *Corpus Christi* College by Archbishop *Parker*, who as President of those Convocations, might dispose as he pleas'd of all preparatory Papers, but could have no right to give away the Records of his Office *.

* Vindic. p. 79. * Id. *ibid.* * *Ibid.* p. 81, &c.

These Arguments concern both Manuscripts in general. As to each in particular, and First that of 1562, I alledge,

1st. That according to this Author's own account of it, 'tis only a foul preparatory Draught of the Articles^y.

2^{dly}. That the Subscription to it is not full and entire, wanting the Hands of two Bishops, who are known to have subscrib'd^z.

3^{dly}. That it is not certain whether this be a Subscription to the XXXIX Articles now in force, or to a Draught of XLII Articles agreed upon antecedently to these XXXIX, and several of them different from these^a.

4^{tly}. That this Manuscript refers to the *Autographum*, which was either the original Subscription from which the Record was ingross'd, or the Record it self, if that was also subscrib'd; and therefore this can be neither that Record, nor that original Subscription^b.

And with regard to the Manuscript of 1571, I argue,

1st. That it is not an entire Subscription so much as of one House of Convocation^c.

2^{dly}. That it is a Subscription, as there express'd, only to XXXVIII Articles^d.

3^{dly}. That it seems to have some Additions to it, of later date than the Manuscript it self^e.

4^{tly}. That the Lower-house of that Con-

^y Vindic. p. 83, &c.

^a Ibid. p. 86, &c.

^c Ibid. p. 91.

^e Ibid. p. 94.

^z Ibid. p. 85.

^b Ibid. p. 88, &c.

^d Ibid. p. 92, &c.

vocation having subscrib'd to a printed Copy of the Articles still extant, and mention'd above; and that containing the contested Clause, it is probable the Upper House took the same Method, at least it is most improbable, that they would at the same time subscribe a Manuscript-copy without the Clause^f.

To all which may be added against the Authority of both these MSS, I mean against their being original Records of Convocation, That very particular which is thought to give them all their Authority, and that is the Subscription made to them, which shews them rather to have been preparatory Subscriptions of the Articles, which were afterwards to be made up into Records, than the Records themselves, which (as was observ'd above) were in all probability not subscrib'd, but only pass'd *viva voce*, after they had been ingross'd from preparatory Subscriptions; and when thus finally pass'd, were ratify'd by annexing the broad Seal to them, as we are assur'd by my Lord Chief Justice *Coke*^g. And this Argument is confirm'd by what I observe of the great resemblance there is between the manner of passing Articles of Religion, Canons, &c. in a Convocation, and that of concluding Articles of Peace in National Treaties; and that the latter being first agreed upon by a preparatory Subscription, and finally concluded by the Ratification upon an ingross'd Instrument, that is most

^f Vindic. p. 95, &c.

^g Instit. p. 4. cap. 74. cit. No Necess. of Reform. p. 360.
Vindic. p. 80. pro-

probably the Method of proceeding in the former, concerning the Circumstances of which since (as a learned Author¹ justly complains) we have so little *Light from the Registers* of Convocation, we can only argue what they probably were from Proceedings of like nature. And this agrees with the account which that Author has given us of these Proceedings. And if this was the Method of passing these Articles, viz. that they were first agreed upon by a preparatory Paper-subscription, then ingross'd in Parchment, and the ingross'd Instrument read over again, and finally pass'd by the Members of both Houses *viva voce*, and last of all ratify'd by the Broad Seal, and then plac'd among the Records of Convocation: If the Articles were pass'd in this manner, as is most probable, then I argue¹, that tho' the MS of 1562 were really the very original preparatory Subscription of that Convocation, from which the Record was afterwards ingross'd, yet it is of no Authority now in any particular, wherein it appears the Record vary'd from it: for that every such variation ought to be regarded, as an amendment agreed upon by the Convocation between the time of their subscribing the Articles on Paper, and their last voting them when ingross'd on Parchment: Between which two Actions of the same Convocation there seems to be as much difference, as there is in Parliament between the Resolution of a Committee of the whole

¹ Synod. Aug. p. 178.

¹ Vindic. p. 122, &c.

House, and the Vote of the House made upon the Report of that Resolution: and therefore we can no more argue from one to the other in those, than we can in these, which often vary, and are sometimes quite contrary.

To make good this Argument, I observe, that there are some things in this MS which must necessarily have been alter'd in the Record, if drawn from it; that the proper time for such alteration was between this preparatory Subscription, and the ingrossing of it; that any alteration made at that time, and pass'd with the ingross'd Instrument, would be of as much Authority, as if it had been made before the Subscription; that the Insertion of the contested Clause was an amendment very proper to be made at that time, if it had been omitted in the preparatory Subscription; and accordingly that that and the other necessary Emendations were actually made in the Record of this Convocation. So that to consider this MS as the very Model, on which the Record was fram'd; yet since we have all this Evidence, that in the framing of that there were several Corrections made upon this Model, I urge, that it is as senseless after this to argue from this MS against the Authority of a Clause, which we have evident proof was in the Record of Convocation, as it would be to argue from the Model of a Building the exact agreement of the Building with it in every Particular, tho' we had Eye-witnesses of some Particulars, wherein the Model and the Building did not agree^k.

^k Vindic. p. 117, to 124.

As to what the Author of *Priestcraft* alleges to prove, that the contested Clause was not contain'd in the *imprinted Book* of Articles referr'd to by the Act of the 13th of *Elizabeth*, viz. that this is a Fact so notorious among the Clergy themselves, that Archbishop *Laud* did not deny it; that Dr. *Fuller*, Dr. *Heylin*, and Bishop *Pearson* did all own it; that the several Impressions of the Articles in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign are an undoubted Evidence of it; and lastly that the very Edition of the Articles referr'd to by the Act (pretended to be one of those still extant without the Clause) proves this Fact even to a Demonstration: I absolutely deny this pretended Notoriety of Fact; and in answer to these Instances I shew,

First, That though Archbishop *Laud* did not affirm, that this Clause was ratify'd by Parliament; because neither this nor any other part of the Articles had any need of such ratification; nor was the Act of the 13th of *Eliz.* made with any such Design; and therefore it was only obliquely at the most, that any of the Articles were ratify'd by this Act: yet he not only affirm'd, but evidently prov'd, that this Clause had all that Authority, which the Objector means by this pretended Ratification¹.

Secondly, That Dr. *Heylin* did for this reason deny, that the Articles were ratify'd by Parliament, and yet was so far from confirming any thing said by Dr. *Fuller* against the Authority of this Clause, that he confutes all that is said by *Fuller* to that

¹ Ibid. p. 25, &c.

purpose, and declares himself to have been an Eye-witness of that Authority^m.

Thirdly, That the Author of *Priestcraft* falsifies Dr. *Fuller*, and is forc'd to own the Doctor was convinc'd of the Authority of this Clause, at the same time that he brings him in as an Evidence against itⁿ.

Fourthly, That Bishop *Pearson* does neither say, nor certainly imply what this Author makes him attest; and yet if that were imply'd in what the Bishop says, his Words do at the same time not only imply, but declare the Authority of the Clause, which the Author of *Priestcraft* cites them to disprove^o.

Fifthly, That all that can be argu'd from some few Editions of the Articles without the Clause in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, when yet there were more that had it, is only, that there have been Enemies to the Authority of the Church as long as since that time^p: that however our Author falsifies Archbishop *Laud* in making him say, that the Clause was omitted in the Editions of that Reign for 22 Years; and that himself most probably knew this Fact to be otherwise^q. And

Lastly, Whereas he challenges us to produce any one English Edition of the Articles printed in, or before the Year 1571 that contains the disputed Clause; and is so confident we cannot, that he not only charges Bishop *Pearson* with downright *Forgery and Falsification*, for asserting that he had seen

^m Vindic. p. 25, 39, 127, &c. ⁿ Ibid. p. 130, &c.

^o Ibid. p. 136, &c.

^p Ibid. p. 143, &c.

^q Ibid. p. 148, &c.

such

such an Edition, but calls this putting the Matter on such an Issue, as may clearly demonstrate his Point, I produce him not only *one*, but three several Editions of that very Year 1571, all containing the contested Clause, and all printed by *Jugge* and *Cawood* the Queen's Printers, and by the Royal Authority; and according to this Author's own way of arguing, this is a demonstration, that the Clause was contain'd in the imprinted Book of Articles, ratify'd (as he calls it) by Parliament: for to use his own words, *|| If that Book was one of those printed An. 1571, as he is willing to believe, and I have endeavour'd to make probable, (Pref. p. 48, &c.) nothing can be plainer, than that the Clause of the Church's Power was ratify'd by Parliament. For I have produc'd three Editions of that very Year with the Clause: and they have lain several Months at Mr. Wilkin's for the Satisfaction of all Inquirers.*

And whereas the Author of *Priestcraft* would insinuate *, that there was a Book of Articles tack'd to the original Record of this Act, and purloin'd from it since; besides what I have said † to shew the Malice of that Insinuation, and that there is no probability of the Fact; but rather that his speaking with so little assurance of it, is a proof, that either he did not examine the Record, or if he did, he found there had been no Book tack'd to it: Now I can assure him, that I have examin'd it carefully my self, and that there is not the least Footstep in the Record of any Book ha-

|| Pr. Cr. p. 17.

* Vindic. p. 139, &c.

† Pr. Cr. p. 13.

† Vindic. p. 31.

ving

ving been ever tack'd to it : nay that its being it self join'd in one long continued Roll, with all the Acts pass'd before and after it that Year, it was hardly possible that any such Book should have been ever tack'd to it either at the beginning or end of it, which is the usual way of tacking Scedules to larger Instruments, because that would have interrupted the Roll : and these Records being roll'd up on purpose to preserve them, if it had been tack'd to the side of the Record, it could not have been roll'd up, nor preserv'd.

I cannot close this Abstract better, than by observing the Method that has been us'd by the Faction in this Calumny against the Church. The first step in order to this charge of Forgery, was to get some Editions of the Articles printed without the Clause of the Church's Power; which tho' done not many Years after the Articles were pass'd, yet was so far from being insisted on then, that it was rather conceal'd, and left to ripen into an Objection against the Authority of that Clause, when at a greater distance of time it should not be so easy to discern the spurious Editions of the Articles from such as were genuine. Accordingly (as far as I can find) it was about 70 Years before the Authority of those spurious Copies was pleaded, and then *Burton* took upon him to charge the pretended Forgery upon Archbishop *Laud*, and the Prelates of that time, and alledg'd those Copies in support of that Charge; and this I need not observe was a Prelude to the great Rebellion of 1641. The Archbishop, as we have
seen,

seen, so effectually answer'd their Charge, and clear'd both himself, and the Church, nay and retorted the Fraud upon the Faction, that they have been forc'd even in their own Defence to keep Silence ever since. Now after about 70 Years more, that they seem'd to hope all the Impressions of the Archbishop's Defence might be worn out, and that a foul preparatory MS or two of the Articles might be trump'd up as original Records, after those Records had been above 40 Years since consum'd in those Flames of the City, for which some of their Party 'suffer'd before-hand; MSS which while those Records were in being, were not thought worth mentioning: and when they had so good an assurance, that most of the ancient genuine Editions of the Articles were destroy'd (probably by their procurement) that the Author of *Priestcraft* ventures the Issue of the Cause on our producing so much as one of them. Now, I say, that all things seem'd ripe for attacking the Church afresh with this old Calumny, and gave them hopes of better Success; and when in all appearance too they were for playing over the Game of 1641 again, and giving us an old Prelude to a new Rebellion; they have thought fit to revive this Charge of Forgery against the Church and Clergy; just as of late they have reprinted a *Letter* against Bishop Lake's *Dying Declaration*, without taking notice of two excellent *Answers* to it written about 20 Years

¹ See Lond. Gazette of Apr. 26, and 30. 1666.

ago, when it first came out: and tho' in renewing this Charge of Forgery Archbishop *Laud's* Defence against it is not wholly pass'd over, yet it is represented as a Defence only of himself, and that in effect he own'd the charge as to all the rest. I hope I have sufficiently shewn the contrary; and even from the Archbishop's Speech prov'd the Authority of the Clause in question beyond all contradiction. Yet if this happen to silence the Party for the present, they will be sure to open again, as soon as they can hope all this is forgotten; and by that time perhaps they will hope likewise to destroy those few remaining ancient Copies of the Articles which are genuine, and which beyond their expectation have hitherto escap'd their Hands; and if they think fit to do me the Honour to make the like Attempt upon my *Vindication*, it will be no more than is usual with them, cutting a Knot, which I think I may say without Vainity, they will hardly be able to untie.

This, and many other like Instances that might be given of the Party's brooding over Lyes of their own, till ripe for the Mischief they are always hatching, should teach the Friends of our Church and Constitution to be as vigilant in their Defence, as these Enemies are for their Destruction; to be watchful in opposing every first step made towards their ruin; and if possible to crush these Cockatrices in the Egg.

* See some Reflections on a Letter occasion'd by Bishop *Lake's* dying Declaration, &c.



in
op
lly
De
he
pe
y;
ch
ae-
his
nt,
as
by
ife
ent
ne,
ve
ey
he
ill
ng
out
e.
at
rer
ief.
he
to
ese
be
de
fn

—
Bi-